

Primrose Comprehensive Planning Steering Committee meeting minutes—

8 February 2010

Attending: All members

Dien called the meeting to order at 7:35

1. Motion made by Hayward, seconded by Elkins to approve the minutes of February 1, 2010. Motion carried 8-0.
2. Review of the revision of the latest Draft provided by Standing. Motion made by Gibson to change the language in Chapter 8 page 16 2 (a) (2) to say: Replacement of existing structures unless prohibited by County ordinance, State or Federal Law. Motion seconded by D. Judd. Motion carried 8-0
3. Motion made by Haack, seconded by J. Judd to add a fifth Goal in Chapter 8 page 5 which says, "Permit landowners to use available splits." Motion failed 2-6.
4. Motion made by Haack, seconded by Judd to add a fifth Goal in Chapter 8 page 5 which says, "Permit landowners to use available splits unless it conflicts with the Environmental Resource Protection District or siting criteria". Motion to table the motion until it was determined what was in the Environmental Resource Protection District or siting criteria Environmental Resource Protection District and siting criteria. Motion passed 8-0.
5. Haack moved, and J. Judd seconded, to add a new Objective in Chapter 8, page 5 that says "Limit new development to rural densities as described in the Plan." Motion failed 4-4.
6. Motion made by Haack, seconded by J. Judd to add language in the Policies and Programs section (page 8) language to the effect that the policies and programs listed will not be used to prevent available splits. Motion failed 3-5.
7. Motion made by Haack, seconded by Garfoot, to add language about a retirement home on page 7 of the draft. Motion made to table the motion. Motion carried 8-0.
8. Motion made by J. Judd, seconded by Haack, to delete Group III soils on page 12, Chapter 8. Motion failed 2-6.
9. Motion made by Gibson, seconded by Elkins, to add language on page 12 Chapter 8 under (3) like that of page 2 of the existing Land Use Plan, saying that "No roads or driveways shall be permitted on historically used agricultural lands". Motion made to table the motion. Motion carried 8-0.
10. We discussed whether or not to allow driveways to cross historically used agricultural land, and we discussed various options and language. Garfoot volunteered to work with Standing to put together language regarding an option for building if a person had no available sites under the current Land Use Plan. The idea would be that if a person could either use the building sites he or she would have under the current Plan or, if the person had no place to build under the current Plan, he or she could cross a small amount of agricultural land to reach a

buildable site in pasture or woodland. No one could do both. A person had to choose whether to use the existing Plan or the exception. Driveway length would be limited. Garfoot suggested the following parameters: If the driveway crossed agricultural land, density would be increased to 1 per 70 acres for every house built. The 68 acres remaining after the lot was taken out would be Deed Restricted. There would be Siting Criteria to preserve agricultural land, woodland, and rural character. The remaining density could be put in a density bank to use as a TDR should such a program be developed. He and Standing will get together a draft for the next meeting so that it can be considered as a possible option. Anyone on the Committee that had suggestions in support of this idea should email them to Garfoot or Standing.

11. Motion made by D. Judd, seconded by J. Judd, to put the tabled motions on the table for the next meeting. Motion carried 8-0.
12. It was decided to cancel the February 22 meeting and hold meetings on February 23, 24 and 26. Not sure if all 3 will be needed.

13. Public Comment:

The Website has been updated by Winnie and Julie.

There is a lack of definition of what constitutes agricultural land.

Various typos and inconsistencies were pointed out to Standing who noted them—e.g. environmental “corridors” vs. “district”. Page 12 item two “non-farm rezones or development” should say “non-farm development”. Page 9, “all *contiguous* property under single ownership.”

Historical use doesn’t preserve the consistency test.

Are Chapter 7 and 9 available?

We are 29 years into farm land preservation and there are still people who know who cropped what, but it will be difficult to know that going into the future. The photos are hard to read. Historical use is not a good criteria. On page 6, “productive” agricultural land is used. What does “productive” mean.

densities be tracked on easements in which land is sold. How can Retirement homes should only use one density. Left door open for TDR’s and PDR’s. This won’t do retirement age people any good.

restricted, it may not sell. If land is deed Has a conservation easement on creek and the DNR doesn’t do what they said they would do.

14. Motion to adjourn made by D. Judd, seconded by Gibson. Motion passed 8-0.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Martha Gibson.